

REMARKS

Claims 2-49 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 2-7, 9, and 12-14 are amended, claims 1 and 19 are canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter found therein, and claims 27-49 are added. The dependency of claims 2-13 is changed from canceled claim 1 to claim 25. Claims 2 and 25 are amended to correct minor informalities therein. The amendments have no bearing on the patentability of, at least, claim 25 as the amendments has no effect on how claim 25 is interpreted. Further, the title is amended in response to the Office Action objection. Accordingly, the title is descriptive. No new matter has been added.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the allowable subject matter of claims 9-12 and 20-23 in paragraph 12, on page 4 of the Office Action. However, for the reasons discussed below, all of claims 2-49 are allowable.

In paragraph 5, on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 2 and 25 were objected because of informalities found therein. The amendment to claim 2 corrects the informalities found therein. With respect to claim 25, Applicant respectfully submits that there are no informalities in claim 25. For example, as shown in Figs. 2 and 4 of the Application, the image forming apparatus includes, in part, a process cartridge that is loadable in and unloadable from the mainframe while being guided by the guide portion. The process cartridge also accommodates a photosensitive body and a processing device that acts on the photosensitive body and the guide portion guides one of the photosensitive body and the processing device to shift a position of the one of the photosensitive body and the processing device relative to the process cartridge when the process cartridge is loaded in and unloaded from the mainframe. As Applicant explains, for example, because the process cartridge is loaded and unloaded while the relation positions of the photosensitive body and the processing device are changed, interference between the process cartridge and the exposure unit can be prevented and the process cartridge can be easily replaced

without having to move the exposure unit (page 4, lines 9-14). Thus, there are no informalities with claim 25. It is respectfully requested that the objection to claims 2 and 25 be withdrawn.

In paragraph 7, on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-2, 4-8, 13-14, 16-19 and 24-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Sato et al., JP62-145258A (Sato). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claims 1, 2, 4-8, and 13, the cancellation of claim 1 and the change of dependency of claims 2, 4-8 and 13 from cancelled claim 1 to claim 25 makes the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection moot as to claims 1, 2, 4-8, and 13.

Applicant's invention of claim 14 calls for a process cartridge loadable in and unloadable from an image forming apparatus comprising a photosensitive body; and a processing device acting on the photosensitive body, wherein relative positions of the photosensitive body and the processing device are changeable when the process cartridge is loaded in and unloaded from the image forming apparatus; and at least one of the photosensitive body and the processing device have a first guided portion that fits with a second guide portion that is provided in the image forming apparatus. Sato fails to disclose these features.

Applicant's invention of claim 25 calls for an image forming apparatus comprising a mainframe having a guide portion; a process cartridge that is loadable in and unloadable from the mainframe while being guided by the guide portion, the process cartridge accommodating a photosensitive body and a processing device that acts on the photosensitive body; wherein the guide portion guides one of the photosensitive body and the processing device to shift a position of the one of the photosensitive body and the processing device relative to the process cartridge when the process cartridge is loaded in and unloaded from the mainframe. Sato fails to disclose these features.

Sato fails to disclose that the image forming apparatus has a guide portion as defined in claims 14 and 25. For example, Sato does not disclose or suggest wherein at least one of the photosensitive body and the processing device have a first guided portion that fits with a second guide portion that is provided in the image forming apparatus, as recited in claim 14 (Figs. 1, 3-4, and 6-7 of Sato).

Sato also fails to disclose or suggest that the mainframe of the image forming apparatus has a guide portion and a process cartridge that is loadable in and unloadable from the mainframe while being guided by the guide portion, wherein the guide portion guides one of the photosensitive body and the processing device to shift a position of the one of the photosensitive body and the processing device relative to the process cartridge when the process cartridge is loaded in and unloaded from the mainframe, as recited in claim 25 (Figs. 1, 3-4, and 6-7 of Sato).

Because Sato does not anticipate or suggest each and every feature of claims 14 and 25, Sato cannot anticipate or suggest the subject matter of claims 16-19, and 24, which depend from claim 14, and the subject matter of claims 2, 4-8, 13 and 26 which depend from claim 25, at least for the reasons discussed with respect to claims 14 and 25 and for the additional features recited therein. Thus, the pending claims are patentable over Sato. As explained above, the 102 rejection of claim 1 is made moot by the cancellation of claim 1. Also, the cancellation of claim 19 makes the §102 rejection moot as to claim 19.

In paragraph 10, on page 4 of the Office Action, claims 3 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sato in view of Nishikawa, JP60-140264 A. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Because the Office Action did not identify Nishikawa reference number, Applicant assumes the Office Action is referring to Nishikawa, JP60-140264A. Accordingly, arguments are directed to JP60-140264A (Nishikawa).

The cancellation of claim 1 makes the 103 rejection of claim 3 moot because claim 3 has been amended to depend from claim 25. For, at least, the reason discussed above, Nishikawa fails to overcome the deficiencies of Sato as applied to claim 25.

Nishikawa fails to overcome the deficiencies of Sato as applied to claim 14.

Because the alleged combination of Sato and Nishikawa does not anticipate or suggest the features of claims 14 and 25, the alleged combination cannot possibly render obvious the subject matter of claim 3, which now depends from claim 25, and claim 15, which depends from claim 14, for the reasons discussed with respect to claims 14 and 25, and for the additional features recited therein. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 2-8, 13-18 and 24-49, along with allowed claims 9-12 and 20-23, are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kurt P. Goudy
Registration No. 52,954

JAO:KPG/amw

Attachment:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: November 23, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--